# Mesoscopic Effects in the Fractional Quantum Hall Regime: Chiral Luttinger Liquid versus Fermi Liquid

Michael R. Geller, Daniel Loss, and George Kirczenow

*Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby B.C. V5A 1S6, Canada*

arXiv:cond-mat/9606070v1 11 Jun 1996

## Abstract

We study tunneling through an edge state formed around an antidot in the fractional quantum Hall regime using Wen's chiral Luttinger liquid theory extended to include mesoscopic effects. We identify a new regime where the Aharonov-Bohm oscillation amplitude exhibits a distinctive crossover from Luttinger liquid power-law behavior to Fermi-liquid-like behavior as the temperature is increased. Near the crossover temperature the amplitude has a pronounced maximum. This non-monotonic behavior and novel high-temperature nonlinear phenomena that we also predict provide new ways to distinguish experimentally between Luttinger and Fermi liquids.

Typeset using REVTEX

One of the most important outstanding questions in the study of the quantum Hall effect [1] concerns the nature of the transport in the fractional regime. It has been established that for integral Landau-level filling factors, many aspects of the quantum Hall effect can be understood in terms of Halperin's edge states of the two-dimensional noninteracting electron gas [2], and a useful description of this is provided by the Büttiker-Landauer formalism [3]. However, as was shown by Laughlin [4], the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) occurs because strong electron-electron interactions lead to the formation of highly correlated incompressible states at certain fractional filling factors. In a large class of one-dimensional systems, interactions lead to a breakdown of Fermi liquid theory and to the formation of a Luttinger liquid with a vanishing quasiparticle weight and with, instead, bosonic low-energy excitations [5,6]. Transport in a Luttinger liquid was studied by Kane and Fisher [7], who have shown that the conductance of a weakly disordered Luttinger liquid vanishes in the zero-temperature limit, in striking contrast to a Fermi liquid. The important connection between Luttinger liquids and the FQHE was made by Wen [8], who used the Chern-Simons effective field theory of the bulk FQHE [9] to show that edge states in the fractional regime should be *chiral* Luttinger liquids. Wen's proposal has stimulated a considerable theoretical effort to understand the properties of this exotic non-Fermi-liquid state of matter [8,10–15].

The first experimental evidence for a chiral Luttinger liquid (CLL) was reported by Milliken *et al.* [16] on the tunneling between FQHE edge states in a quantum point contact geometry. As the gate voltage was varied, resonance peaks in the conductance (caused by conditions of destructive interference that prevent impurity-assisted tunneling between the two edge channels) were observed that have the correct CLL temperature dependence as predicted by Moon *et al.* [11] and also by Fendley *et al.* [14]. In addition, Chang *et al.* [17], working with a different type of system, have very recently reported experimental evidence that is also in favor of CLL theory. However, recent experiments by Franklin *et al.* [18] on Aharonov-Bohm oscillations and by Maasilta and Goldman [19] on resonant tunneling in constrictions containing a quantum antidot are consistent with Fermi liquid theory. This agreement with Fermi liquid theory does not in itself rule out CLL theory

because no detailed CLL theory for the antidot geometry has been available. This has motivated us to provide such a theory for the experimentally realizable and analytically solvable strong-antidot-coupling regime.

In this Letter, we study the Aharonov-Bohm (AB) effect in the FQHE regime using CLL theory and extending it to include mesoscopic effects. The problem we address may be realized experimentally by measuring the tunneling through an edge state formed around a quantum antidot, as in the experiments of Franklin *et al.* [18] and of Maasilta and Goldman [19]. (However, as explained below, our CLL theory is applicable in a regime different from the one in which these experiments were carried out.) We begin by briefly summarizing our results: The finite size of the antidot introduces a new temperature scale,

$$T_0 \equiv \frac{\hbar v}{\pi k_{\rm B} L}, \tag{1}$$

where $v$ is the edge-state Fermi velocity and $L$ is the circumference of the antidot edge state. For example, a Fermi velocity of $10^6$ cm/s and circumference of 1 $\mu$m yields an experimentally accessible $T_0 \approx 20$mK. In the strong-antidot-coupling regime, CLL theory for filling factor $1/q$ ($q$ odd) predicts the low-temperature ($T \ll T_0$) AB oscillation amplitude to vanish with temperature as $T^{2q-2}$, in striking contrast with Fermi liquid theory ($q = 1$). For $T$ near $T_0$, there is a pronounced maximum in the AB amplitude, also in contrast to a Fermi liquid. At high temperatures ($T \gg T_0$), however, we predict a new crossover to a $T^{2q-1}e^{-qT/T_0}$ temperature dependence, which is qualitatively similar to Fermi liquid behavior. Experiments in the strong-antidot-coupling regime should be able to distinguish between a Fermi liquid and our predicted nearly Fermi liquid scaling. The finite size of the antidot also leads to a remarkable *high-temperature* nonlinear response regime, where the voltage $V$ satisfies $V \gg T \gg T_0$, which may also be used to distinguish between Fermi liquid and CLL behavior.

To study mesoscopic effects associated with edge states in the FQHE, we shall extend CLL theory to include finite-size effects. Finite-size effects in nonchiral Luttinger liquids have been addressed in Refs. [6] and [20]. To proceed in the chiral case we bosonize the

electron field operators $\psi_\pm$ according to the convention

$$\rho_\pm = \pm\frac{\partial_x \phi_\pm}{2\pi}, \tag{2}$$

where $\rho_\pm$ is the normal-ordered charge density and $\phi_\pm$ is a chiral scalar field for right (+) or left (–) movers. The dynamics of $\phi_\pm$ is governed by Wen's Euclidian action [8]

$$S_\pm = \frac{1}{4\pi g}\int_0^L dx \int_0^\beta d\tau\ \partial_x\phi_\pm(\ \pm i\partial_\tau\phi_\pm + v\partial_x\phi_\pm), \tag{3}$$

where $g = 1/q$ ($q$ odd) is the bulk filling factor and $v$ is the Fermi velocity. Here $L$ is the size (i.e., length) of a given edge state. The field theory described by (3) may be canonically quantized by imposing the equal-time commutation relation (modulo periodic extension)

$$[\phi_\pm(x), \phi_\pm(x')] = \pm i\pi g\,\mathrm{sgn}(x - x'). \tag{4}$$

We then decompose $\phi_\pm$ into a nonzero-mode contribution $\bar{\phi}_\pm$ satisfying periodic boundary conditions that describes the neutral excitations, and a zero-mode contribution $\phi^0_\pm$ that describes charged excitations: $\phi_\pm = \bar{\phi}_\pm + \phi^0_\pm$. The nonzero-mode contribution may be expanded in a basis of Bose annihilation and creation operators in the usual fashion,

$$\bar{\phi}_\pm(x) = \sum_{k\neq 0}\theta(\pm k)\sqrt{\frac{2\pi g}{|k|L}}(a_k e^{ikx} + a_k^\dagger e^{-ikx})e^{-|k|a/2}, \tag{5}$$

with coefficients determined by the requirement that $\bar{\phi}_\pm$ itself satisfies (4) in the $L\to\infty$ limit. In a finite-size system, however,

$$[\bar{\phi}_\pm(x), \bar{\phi}_\pm(x')] = \pm i\pi g\,\mathrm{sgn}(x - x') \mp \frac{2\pi i g}{L}(x - x'), \tag{6}$$

so we must require the zero-mode contribution to satisfy

$$[\phi^0_\pm(x), \phi^0_\pm(x')] = \pm\frac{2\pi i g}{L}(x - x') \tag{7}$$

for the total field to satisfy (4). An expansion analogous to (5) for $\phi^0_\pm$ may be constructed from the condition (7) and, in addition, the requirement

$$\phi^0_\pm(x + L) - \phi^0_\pm(x) = \pm 2\pi N_\pm, \tag{8}$$

which follows from (2), where $N_\pm \equiv \int_0^L dx\, \rho_\pm$ is the charge of an excited state relative to the ground state. Conditions (7) and (8) together determine $\phi_\pm^0$, up to an additive c-number constant, as

$$\phi_\pm^0(x) = \pm\frac{2\pi}{L}N_\pm x - g\,\chi_\pm, \tag{9}$$

where $\chi_\pm$ is a phase operator conjugate to $N_\pm$ satisfying $[\chi_\pm, N_\pm] = i$. Equations (5) and (9) may now be used to write the normal-ordered Hamiltonian corresponding to (3) as

$$H_\pm = \frac{v}{4\pi g}\int_0^L dx(\partial_x\phi_\pm)^2 = \frac{\pi v}{gL}N_\pm^2 + \sum_{k\neq 0}\theta(\pm k)v|k|a_k^\dagger a_k. \tag{10}$$

In a finite-size system, the level spacing for neutral and charged excitations scale with system size as $1/L$, and they become gapless in the $L\to\infty$ limit.

What are the allowed eigenvalues of $N_\pm$? The answer may be determined by bosonization: To create an electron, we need a $\pm 2\pi$ kink in $\phi_\pm$. The electron field operators can therefore be bosonized as

$$\psi_\pm(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\, e^{i[\phi_\pm(x)\pm\frac{\pi x}{L}]/g}, \tag{11}$$

where $a$ is the same microscopic cutoff length that appears in (5). The additional c-number phase factor is chosen for convenience. To see that (11) is valid, note that $[\rho_\pm(x), \psi_\pm^\dagger(x')] = \delta(x-x')\psi_\pm^\dagger(x')$, so $\psi_\pm^\dagger(x)$ creates an electron at position $x$. Equation (11) implies that $\psi_\pm(x+L) = \psi_\pm(x)e^{\pm i2\pi N_\pm/g}$. Thus, periodic boundary conditions on $\psi_\pm(x)$ lead to the important result that the allowed eigenvalues of $N_\pm$ are given by

$$N_\pm = ng, \tag{12}$$

which means that there exists *fractionally charged* excitations or quasiparticles, as expected in a FQHE system.

Coupling to an AB flux $\Phi$ is achieved by adding $\delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{c}j_\pm A$ to the Lagrangian, where $j_\pm = \pm\frac{e}{2\pi}\partial_t\phi_\pm$ is the bosonized current density and $A$ is a vector potential. The flux couples only to the zero modes, and results in the replacement $N_\pm^2 \to (N_\pm \pm g\Phi/\Phi_0)^2$ in (10), where

$\Phi_0 \equiv hc/e$. The grand-canonical partition function of the mesoscopic edge state factorizes into a zero-mode contribution, $Z^0 = \sum_n e^{-\pi g v (n-\Phi/\Phi_0)^2/LT}$, which depends on $\Phi$, and a flux-independent contribution from the nonzero modes [21]. Note that if the $N_\pm$ were restricted to be integral, then the partition function and the associated grand-canonical potential would be periodic functions of flux with period $\Phi_0/g$. The fractionally charged excitations (12) are therefore responsible for restoring the AB period to the proper value $\Phi_0$, as is known in other contexts [22].

We begin our study of transport by performing a perturbative renormalization group (RG) analysis in the weak-antidot-coupling regime (see Fig. 1a). In this case, $S = S_0 + \delta S$, where $S_0 \equiv S_{\rm L} + S_{\rm R} + S_{\rm A}$ is the sum of actions of the form (3) for the left moving, right moving, and antidot edge states, respectively, and $\delta S \equiv \sum_m \int_\tau (V_+ + V_- + \text{c.c.})$ is the weak coupling between them. Here $V_\pm(\tau) \equiv \Gamma_\pm^{(m)} e^{im\phi_\pm(x_\pm,\tau)} e^{-im\phi_A(x_\pm,\tau)}/2\pi a$ describes the tunneling of $m$ quasiparticles from an incident edge state into the antidot edge state at point $x_\pm$ with dimensionless amplitude $\Gamma_\pm^{(m)}$ [7]. We assume the leads, described by $S_{\rm L}$ and $S_{\rm R}$, to be macroscopic, and we also assume for simplicity that $|\Gamma_-^{(m)}| = |\Gamma_+^{(m)}|$. We shall need the correlation function $C_\pm(x,\tau) \equiv \langle e^{im\phi_\pm(x,\tau)} e^{-im\phi_\pm(0)} \rangle$ taken with respect to $S_0$, which, at zero temperature and for values of $x$ such that $x \ll L$, is given by

$$C_\pm(x,\tau) = \left( \frac{\pm ia}{x \pm iv\tau \pm ia} \right)^{2\Delta}, \tag{13}$$

where $\Delta = m^2 g/2$ is the scaling dimension of $e^{im\phi_\pm}$.

Consider now the correlation function

$$\langle V_+^\dagger(\tau) V_+(0) \rangle = \frac{|\Gamma_+^{(m)}|^2}{4\pi^2 a^2} \langle e^{-im\phi_+(x_+,\tau)} e^{im\phi_+(x_+,0)} \rangle \langle e^{im\phi_A(x_+,\tau)} e^{-im\phi_A(x_+,0)} \rangle, \tag{14}$$

which arises in a perturbative calculation of the total partition function $Z = \int \mathcal{D}\phi_L \mathcal{D}\phi_R \mathcal{D}\phi_A e^{-S}$. For $Z$ to be invariant under a small decrease in cutoff $a \to a' = sa$, we need $\Gamma' = s^{1-2\Delta}\Gamma$, or

$$\frac{d\Gamma_+^{(m)}}{d\ell} = (1 - m^2 g)\Gamma_+^{(m)}, \tag{15}$$

where $\ell \equiv \ln(a/a')$. $\Gamma_-^{(m)}$ satisfies an identical RG equation. These leading-order flow equations, which show that quasiparticle ($m = 1$) backscattering processes are relevant and electron ($m = 1/g$) backscattering is irrelevant when $g = 1/3$, were first derived by Kane and Fisher [7] using momentum-shell RG.

Next consider the correlation function $\langle V_+^\dagger(\tau)V_+(0)V_-^\dagger(\tau')V_-(0)\rangle$, which arises in fourth order. A Wick expansion gives *local* terms as in (14), and, in addition, *nonlocal* antidot correlation functions like $\langle e^{im\phi_A(x,\tau)}e^{-im\phi_A(0)}\rangle$ with $x \neq 0$. Equation (13) shows that the nonlocal terms (for $x \ll L$, with $L$ now the size of the antidot edge state) scale in the same way as the local terms [23]. The Kane-Fisher flow equations (15) are therefore valid in the antidot problem considered here.

This scaling analysis shows that off resonance [24] and at low temperatures the antidot will be in the strongly coupled regime shown in Fig. 1b. Furthermore, if the antidot system starts in the strongly coupled regime (by an appropriate choice of gate voltages), it will stay in this regime because the $m = 1$ quasiparticle backscattering process (which would be relevant in the RG sense) is not allowed in this edge-state configuration and only electrons can tunnel. The strong-antidot-coupling regime therefore admits a perturbative treatment [25], to which we now turn. Details of the calculations shall be given elsewhere.

The current passing between edge states $L'$ and $R'$, driven by their potential difference $V$, is defined by (restoring units) $I \equiv -e\langle \dot{N}_{L'}(t)\rangle$, where $N_{L'}$ is the charge of edge state $L'$ as defined before (9). The current is now evaluated for small tunneling amplitudes $\Gamma_i$ ($i = 1, 2$), which for simplicity are taken to be equal apart from AB phase factors [26]. The result is

$$I = -2|\Gamma|^2 \,\mathrm{Im}\left[X_{11}(\omega) + X_{22}(\omega) + e^{i2\pi\Phi/\Phi_0}\, X_{12}(\omega) + e^{-i2\pi\Phi/\Phi_0}\, X_{21}(\omega)\right]_{\omega=V}, \tag{16}$$

where $X_{ij}(\omega)$ is the Fourier transform of $X_{ij}(t) \equiv -i\theta(t)\langle[B_i(t), B_j^\dagger(0)]\rangle$ and $B_i \equiv \psi_L(x_i)\psi_R^\dagger(x_i)$ is an electron tunneling operator acting at point $x_i$. This response function can be calculated using bosonization techniques and the result for filling factor $1/q$ is

$$X_{ij}(t) = -\theta(t)\frac{a^{2q-2}}{2\pi^2}\ \mathrm{Im}\,\frac{(\pi/L_\mathrm{T})^{2q}}{\sinh^q[\pi(x_i - x_j + vt + ia)/L_\mathrm{T}]\sinh^q[\pi(x_i - x_j - vt - ia)/L_\mathrm{T}]}\ , \tag{17}$$

where $L_{\rm T} \equiv \beta v$ is the thermal length. Each term $X_{ij}$ in (16) corresponds to a process occurring with a probability proportional to $|\Gamma_i \Gamma_j|$. The *local* terms $X_{11}$ and $X_{22}$ therefore describe *independent* tunneling at $x_1$ and $x_2$, respectively, whereas the *nonlocal* terms $X_{12}$ and $X_{21}$ describe *coherent* tunneling through both points. The AB phase naturally couples only to the latter. We shall see that the local contributions behave exactly like the tunneling in a quantum point contact. The AB effect, however, is a consequence of the nonlocal terms, and we shall show that there are new non-Fermi-liquid phenomena associated with these terms that are directly accessible to experiment.

We have Fourier transformed (17) exactly and find a crossover behavior in the nonlocal response functions when the thermal length $L_T$ becomes less than $|x_i - x_j|$. The finite size of the antidot therefore provides an important new temperature scale given in Eqn. (1). Note that $T_0$ is closely related to the energy level spacing $\Delta\epsilon \equiv 2\pi v/L$ for noninteracting electrons with linear dispersion in a ring of circumference $L$: $T_0 = \Delta\epsilon/2\pi^2$. The current in the strong-antidot-coupling regime can generally be written as $I = I_0 + I_{\rm AB}\cos(2\pi\Phi/\Phi_0)$, where $I_0$ is the *direct* contribution resulting from the local terms and $I_{\rm AB}$ is the AB contribution resulting from the nonlocal terms. For noninteracting electrons, the Büttiker-Landauer formula or our perturbation theory with $q = 1$ may be used to show that $I_0^{FL} = |\Gamma|^2 V/\pi$ and $I_{\rm AB}^{FL} = 2|\Gamma|^2 T \sinh^{-1}(T/T_0)\sin(VL/2v)$. The corresponding conductances are $G_0^{\rm FL} = |\Gamma|^2/\pi$ and $G_{\rm AB}^{\rm FL} = (|\Gamma|^2/\pi)(T/T_0)\sinh^{-1}(T/T_0)$.

The exact current-voltage relation for the $q = 3$ CLL is

$$I_0 = \frac{|\Gamma|^2 a^4 V}{120\pi v^6}\Big(112\pi^4 T^4 + 40\pi^2 T^2 V^2 + V^4\Big), \tag{18}$$

and

$$I_{\rm AB} = -\frac{|\Gamma|^2 a^4 \pi^2}{v^6}\frac{T^3}{\sinh^3(T/T_0)}\Big\{\ \Big[\ V^2 + 4\pi^2 T^2\Big(1 - 3\coth^2(T/T_0)\Big)\Big]\sin\left(\frac{VL}{2v}\right) + 6\pi V T\coth(T/T_0)\cos\left(\frac{VL}{2v}\right)\Big\}. \tag{19}$$

In the limit $L \to 0$, $I_{\rm AB}$ always reduces to $I_0$. The AB conductance is

$$G_{\rm AB} = -\frac{2\pi^3|\Gamma|^2 a^4}{v^6}\frac{T^4}{\sinh^3(T/T_0)}\Big\{3\coth\left(\frac{T}{T_0}\right) + \left(\frac{T}{T_0}\right)\Big[1 - 3\coth^2\left(\frac{T}{T_0}\right)\Big]\Big\}, \tag{20}$$

which is shown in Fig. 1c along with the corresponding Fermi-liquid result..

We now summarize our results for general $q$. The complete phase diagram is very rich and will be described in detail elsewhere. Here we shall summarize the transport properties as a function of temperature for fixed voltage, first for $V \ll T_0$ and then for $V \gg T_0$.

*Low-voltage* ($V \ll T_0$) *regime*: There are three temperature regimes here. When $T \ll V \ll T_0$, both $I_0$ and $I_{\rm AB}$ have nonlinear behavior, varying with voltage as $V^{2q-1}$. When the temperature exceeds $V$, the response becomes linear. When $V \ll T \ll T_0$, both $G_0$ and $G_{\rm AB}$ vary with temperature as

$$G \propto \left(\frac{T}{T_F}\right)^{2q-2}, \tag{21}$$

in striking contrast to a Fermi liquid ($q = 1$). This is the same low-temperature power-law scaling predicted [7,11,14] and observed [16] in a quantum point contact tunneling geometry. Here $T_{\rm F} \equiv v/a$ is an effective Fermi temperature. Near $T \approx 2T_0$ for the $q = 3$ case, we find that $G_{\rm AB}$ displays a pronounced maximum, also in contrast to a Fermi liquid (see Fig. 1c). Increasing the temperature further, however, we cross over into the $V \ll T_0 \ll T$ regime, where $G_0$ scales as in (21), but now

$$G_{\rm AB} \propto \left(\frac{T}{T_0}\right)\left(\frac{T}{T_{\rm F}}\right)^{2q-2} e^{-qT/T_0}. \tag{22}$$

Thus, the AB oscillation amplitude exhibits a crossover from the well-known $T^{2q-2}$ Luttinger liquid behavior to a new scaling behavior that is much closer to a Fermi liquid. However, as compared to the Fermi liquid case, the crossover temperature here is effectively *lower* by a factor of $q$. Careful measurements in this experimentally accessible regime should be able to distinguish between a Fermi liquid and our predicted nearly Fermi-liquid temperature dependence.

*High-voltage* ($V \gg T_0$) *regime*: Again there are three temperature regimes. At the lowest temperatures, $T \ll T_0 \ll V$, the response is nonlinear. The direct contribution varies with voltage as $I_0 \propto V^{2q-1}$. The AB current is more complicated, involving power-laws times trigonometric functions of the ratio $V/T_0$. For the case $q = 3$,

$$I_{\rm AB} = -\frac{8|\Gamma|^2 a^4}{\pi v L^5}\Big\{\Big[\frac{3V}{2\pi T_0}\Big]\cos\Big(\frac{V}{2\pi T_0}\Big) - \Big[3 - \Big(\frac{V}{2\pi T_0}\Big)^2\Big]\sin\Big(\frac{V}{2\pi T_0}\Big)\Big\}. \tag{23}$$

As the temperature is increased further to $T_0 \ll T \ll V$, we find a crossover to a remarkable *high-temperature* nonlinear regime. Here, $I_0 \propto V^{2q-1}$ as before, but now

$$I_{\rm AB} \propto \Big(\frac{T}{T_0}\Big)^q e^{-qT/T_0} V^{q-1} \sin\Big(\frac{V}{2\pi T_0}\Big). \tag{24}$$

Note the additional $V^{q-1}$ term that is not present in the corresponding Fermi liquid result. Therefore, the nonlinear response can also be used to distinguish between Fermi liquid and CLL behavior, even at relatively high temperatures. When the temperature exceeds V, the response finally becomes linear. When $T_0 \ll V \ll T$, $G_0$ scales as in (21), whereas $G_{\rm AB}$ scales as in (22). Thus, at high temperatures the low- and high-voltage regimes behave similarily.

In conclusion, we have studied the AB effect for filling factor $1/q$ ($q$ odd) in the strong-antidot-coupling limit with CLL theory. The low-temperature linear response is similar to that in a quantum point contact. However, the AB oscillations are a mesoscopic effect and, as such, are diminished in amplitude above a crossover temperature $T_0$ determined by the size of the antidot. Above $T_0$, the temperature dependence of the AB oscillations is qualitatively similar to that in a Fermi liquid (see Fig. 1c). It is clear that a related crossover occurs in the weak-antidot-coupling regime as well. In addition, we have identified a new high-temperature nonlinear response regime that may also be used to distinguish between a Fermi and Luttinger liquid.

We thank Leonid Pryadko for useful discussions. This work has been supported by NSERC of Canada.

# REFERENCES


[1] *The Quantum Hall Effect*, edited by R. E. Prange and S. M. Girvin (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990).

[2] B. I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 2185 (1982).

[3] M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1761 (1986); P. Streda, J. Kucera, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1973 (1987); J. K. Jain and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1542 (1988); M. Büttiker, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 9375 (1988).

[4] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).

[5] For reviews see J. Sólyom, Adv. Phys. **28**, 201 (1979), and V. J. Emery, in *Highly Conducting One-Dimensional Solids*, edited by J. T. Devreese, R. P. Evrard, and V. E. van Doren (Plenum, New York, 1979), p. 247.

[6] F. D. M. Haldane, J. Phys. C **14**, 2585 (1981).

[7] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1220 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15233 (1992).

[8] For reviews see X. G. Wen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **6**, 1711 (1992), and X. G. Wen, Adv. Phys. **44**, 405 (1995).

[9] S. M. Girvin, in Chap. 10 of Ref. [1]. S. C. Zhang, T. H. Hansson, and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 82 (1989). A. Lopez and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 5246 (1991).

[10] C. de C. Chamon and X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2605 (1993).

[11] K. Moon, H. Yi, C. L. Kane, S. M. Girvin, and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4381 (1993).

[12] V. L. Pokrovsky and L. P. Pryadko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 124 (1994).

[13] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 13449 (1995).

[14] P. Fendley, A. W. W. Ludwig, and H. Saleur, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3005 (1995).

[15] J. J. Palacios and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 118 (1996).

[16] F. P. Milliken, C. P. Umbach, and R. A. Webb, Solid State Commun. **97**, 309 (1996).

[17] A. M. Chang, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West (unpublished).

[18] J. D. F. Franklin *et al.*, Surf. Sci. (to be published).

[19] I. J. Maasilta and V. J. Goldman (unpublished).

[20] D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 343 (1992).

[21] The chiral "persistent currents" associated with FQHE edge states have a universal non-Fermi-liquid temperature dependence and will be discussed elsewhere.

[22] P. A. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2206 (1990). S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3369 (1990). D. J. Thouless and Y. Gefen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 806 (1991).

[23] Nonlocal terms with $x \approx L$ are always irrelevant.

[24] We define resonance here in the sense it is used in the Luttinger liquid literature: The system is said to be on resonance when the AB flux *prevents* transmission through the antidot, *i.e.,* if $\Phi/\Phi_0 = j + \frac{1}{2}$, where $j$ is an integer. Thus, CLL theory at low temperature predicts peaks in the two-terminal conductance on resonance, and vanishing conductance elsewhere. This definition is opposite to what is usually used in the antidot literature, which defines resonance to occur when the flux *allows* tunneling through the antidot, that is, when $\Phi/\Phi_0 = j$.

[25] X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 5708 (1991).

[26] To simplify our expressions in the nonlinear response regime, we apply the potential difference $V$ symmetrically about an antidot energy level. Therefore, as the voltage is varied the two chemical potentials move in opposite directions at half the rate at which

the voltage changes. A consequence of this symmetrization is that the nonlinear response in the Fermi liquid case has a simple sinusoidal dependence on $V$, with a period equal to *twice* the antidot level spacing.

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. (a) Aharonov-Bohm effect geometry in the weak-antidot-coupling regime. The solid lines represent edge states and the dashed lines denote weak tunneling points. (b) Edge-state configuration in the strong-antidot-coupling regime. Here the edge states are almost completely reflected. (c) Temperature dependence of $G_{\rm AB}$ for the cases $q = 1$ (dashed curve) and $q = 3$ (solid curve). Each curve is normalized to have unit amplitude at its maximum.